

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re: Chapter 11
W.R. GRACE & CO., et al., Case No. 01-01139 (JKF)
Debtors. Jointly Administered
Ref. No. 21544

DEPOSITION OF JOHN PARKER, M.D.,
a witness herein, called for examination by the
Claimants, taken pursuant to the Federal Rules of
Bankruptcy Procedure, by and before Susan E. Alldridge,
a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in
and for the State of West Virginia, at the Ramada Inn
Conference Center, 20 Scott Avenue, Morgantown,
West Virginia on Tuesday, 9 June 2009, at 9:09 a.m.

1 produced from the radiographs I reviewed with them.

2 Q. And the predominantly pleural disease over
3 interstitial fibrosis, that would be different from
4 Chrysotile in a significant way?

5 A. Chrysotile does not produce as much
6 pleural abnormality as parenchymal abnormality, in
7 my experience.

8 Q. Is it significantly less?

9 A. It's related to dose response
10 relationships affecting the pleura and the
11 parenchyma.

12 Q. I was wondering if it's significantly less
13 than amphibole --

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. -- cohort.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay. And in your review of Libby chest
18 x-rays, did you see a lot of thin but extensive
19 visceral pleural thickening?

20 A. Most costophrenic angle blunting that was
21 present was also accompanied by parietal pleural
22 plaques. There also was some costophrenic angle
23 blunting that would meet the definition of B2 by
24 ILO. I suspect most of what I saw of costophrenic

1 angle blunting would meet the B2 ILO definition, at
2 least unilaterally.

3 Q. I was asking about thin but extensive --

4 A. I did not --

5 Q. -- visceral pleural thickening. Did you
6 see a lot of that?

7 A. I saw some costophrenic angle blunting
8 that would not meet the ILO definition of B2 but
9 would meet the ILO definition of B1.

10 Q. And would that be significantly different
11 than Chrysotile presentations?

12 A. Yes, in my experience.

13 Q. And in the Libby x-rays, did you see a
14 lower incidence of blunting with visceral pleural
15 thickening than you've seen elsewhere?

16 A. No.

17 Q. And in the Libby chest x-rays, did you see
18 significant subpleural interstitial fibrosis?

19 A. It's been present but not different than
20 other cohorts.

21 Q. Not different than other amphibole
22 cohorts?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Would that be different from Chrysotile

1 cohorts?

2 A. Not always.

3 Q. "Not always," did you say?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Generally, is it?

6 A. Generally, yes.

7 Q. And in the Libby chest x-rays, did you see
8 more -- or did you see cases of pure pleural
9 disease with no interstitial fibrosis?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And is that consistent with other
12 amphibole cohorts?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And is that also significantly different
15 from Chrysotile cohorts?

16 A. Not always, no.

17 Q. Generally so?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And when you compared CT scans to chest
20 x-rays on the same people from Libby, did you note
21 that the CT scans showed a lot more pleural
22 disease?

23 A. Yes. The CT scans did demonstrate more
24 pleural disease than was appreciated on the chest

1 x-ray.

2 Q. And is that consistent with amphibole
3 cohorts?

4 A. Yes. And Chrysotile cohorts.

5 Q. And then you mentioned the amosite cohort
6 from Paterson, New Jersey. Did you do any work on
7 that same cohort after it moved to Tyler, Texas?

8 A. No, I did not.

9 Q. A lot of the same workers moved from
10 New Jersey to Texas, didn't they?

11 A. I'm not sure if it was the workers who
12 moved. I guess it was the workers who moved. I
13 was going to say also some of the investigators
14 moved, too.

15 Q. Any other amphibole cohorts in the
16 United States that you've done work on?

17 A. No, I don't believe so.

18 Q. On page 10 of Exhibit 1, just above the
19 new caption "The Importance Of," there's a sentence
20 beginning "The Libby radiographic and clinical
21 findings are consistent with international
22 populations exposed to amphibole asbestos."

23 And what are you referring to in terms of
24 clinical findings there?

1 A. Could you redirect me? I actually didn't
2 see where it was.

3 Above the bold.

4 Q. Yes.

5 A. Yes. I meant that populations exposed to
6 amphiboles in Finland and Turkey and Australia and
7 South Africa and other locations have had
8 radiographic findings with extensive pleural
9 abnormalities sometimes reported. And clinical
10 findings of effusions, clinical findings of rounded
11 atelectasis, clinical findings of parietal plaques,
12 clinical findings of lung cancer, clinical findings
13 of diffuse pleural thickening have been identified
14 in other international populations that are
15 amphibole exposed. And the Libby's findings were
16 quite typical of those that have been seen and
17 reported internationally.

18 Q. Okay. So as to effusions, the Libby
19 findings are consistent with amphiboles?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And would you say the incidence of
22 effusions in Libby is significantly greater than in
23 Chrysotile cohorts?

24 A. Yes. I haven't seen a lot of films myself

1 with effusions from Libby, but the experience
2 reported would make me think that it's more than
3 with Chrysotile, yes.

4 Q. And as to rounded atelectasis, were the
5 Libby films consistent with other amphibole cohort
6 films?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And significantly greater than Chrysotile
9 cohorts?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And as to the incidence of diffuse pleural
12 thickening, was Libby consistent with amphibole
13 cohorts on that issue?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And significantly greater than Chrysotile
16 cohorts?

17 A. Possibly.

18 Q. Did you say "possibly"?

19 A. Possibly.

20 Q. You're not sure?

21 A. I'm not certain.

22 Q. And what about the finding of chest pain?
23 Was -- were the Libby clinical findings in that
24 regard consistent with amphibole cohorts elsewhere?